

## Remarks

Claims 4-7 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claim 4.

Claims 6 and 7 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as directed to a non-elected invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication 2002/0022102 to Kiyohara et al. in view of U.S. patent publication 2001/0030020 to Nandy et al., U.S. patent 5,700,536 to Steidinger and GB 1,420,743 to Ghavt.

The combination of Kiyohara et al., Nandy et al., Steidinger and Ghavt does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4 and 5 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest adhesive areas each including a group of three-dimensional adhesive dots. Additionally, the combination does not suggest that an area of the adhesive dots that contacts the material layer on which the adhesive dots are formed is larger than an area of the dots that contacts the non-adhesive areas on the other material layer to which the dots are attached. The structure of the adhesive dots provides a label laminate that can be manufactured without a release layer. This is possible due to the different sized contact areas of the dots on the layer on which they are formed and the layer to which they are attached.

Kiyohara et al. suggests adhesive layers that appear to be a continuous region of adhesive. The Examiner only cites Nandy et al. as suggesting a certain label material layer. Steidinger only suggests screen printing. Ghavt suggests a structure that requires a release layer.

The claimed invention does not require a release layer. None of the cited references suggests adhesive areas that each includes a plurality of three-dimensional dots or the advantages that such a structure provides, including not requiring a release layer or release agent.

In view of the above, the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application and issuance of the notice of allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urges the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicants  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300